DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 408 UD 021 103

AUTHOR Harrington, Charles
TITLE Bilingual Education in the United States: A View from 1980. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 68, August 1980.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 80
CONTRACT 400-77-0071
NOTE 25p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 ($5.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Compliance (Legal); Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; Financial Support; Multicultural Education; Non English Speaking; *Political Issues; *Program Evaluation; Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS Bilingual Education Act 1968; *Lau v Nichols

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the time period since the 1974 Supreme Court Lau v. Nichols decision, this paper reviews Federal policy regarding bilingual education, discusses the current sociopolitical context of bilingual education, discusses evaluations of bilingual programming done to date, and examines the implications of these factors for schools and classrooms at the local level. Some of the features that distinguish present bilingual education policy from policies adopted in regard to earlier immigrant populations are outlined. Political problems faced by bilingual education since "Lau" are identified as (1) loss of local autonomy, (2) conflict between the legislative and executive branches of government (3) inconsistencies in the guidelines for legal compliance between 1970 and 1974, (4) funding, and (5) reliance on Title VII funds, which perpetuates a deficit (rather than a cultural difference) model of bilingual education. Several recent evaluation studies of bilinigual education programs are reviewed and critical issues common to these evaluations are discussed in terms of their implications for future programs. Finally, a composite model for an exemplary bilingual program is described, based upon what has been learned from previous evaluations. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 68

ED193408

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: A VIEW FROM 1980

Charles Harrington, Ph.D.
Teachers College, Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UD021103

ERIC/CUE URBAN DIVERSITY SERIES
Number 68, August 1980

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: A VIEW FROM 1980

Charles Harrington, Ph.D.
Teachers College, Columbia University

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UC 3

This publication is one of the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education under contract between the National Institute of Education (USDE) and Teachers College, Columbia University. Additional copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructiions will be found in *Resources in Education*, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, for $5.00 each.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-77-0071. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department of Education.

The National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

I. INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1969, I visited an elementary school in Manhattan with a friend who had just been appointed its principal. We toured the school, which neither of us had seen before. It had once had a good reputation under a strong principal famous for his reading program, but because of failing academic achievement, had recently been regarded as a problem school. It didn't take us long to identify the problem or discover why my friend, a bilingual Puerto Rican, had been appointed principal. Sixty percent of the school's 1,600 students were Spanish-speaking, but only one teacher spoke Spanish. We made our first priority the hiring of staff fluent in both Spanish and English. We had two goals: (1) to provide the children instruction in their native language until they could function in English, and (2) to teach them English. To facilitate these processes, we applied for a new kind of funding—a grant under what the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 had added as Title VII to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (hereafter Title VII)—to support the new programs that would be required.

Five years later, in 1974, the Supreme Court of the United States, at the prodding of a parent named Lau, unanimously came to the same conclusion we had reached that day in New York. They went even further. What we had seen as a good for the child, they defined as the child's *right*. The court argued:

> . . . there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum, for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. [*Lau* v. *Nichols*, 414 U.S. at 566]

Since that time, our nation's efforts to serve non-English-speaking populations have assumed greater visibility. The purposes of this paper are to review the history of Federal policy regarding bilingual education, to discuss the sociopolitical context, to discuss the evaluations of bilingual programming done to date, and to examine the implications of these factors for schools and classrooms at the local level. We will focus our review on what has happened since the Supreme Court's decision on *Lau* v. *Nichols*, and the degree to which efforts have actually improved the quality of education received by non-English-dominant children.

I am grateful for the collaboration of Herminio Martinez and Marietta Saravia-Shore with whom I wrote a proposal concerning exemplary bilingual programming upon which that part of this paper is now based. It was listening to Tracy Gray's (1980) speech that I saw the comparison of AIR with the work of Lambert and Tucker to be a useful way of raising more general evaluation issues, and I am grateful to her for the idea. I am also indebted to Janet Skupien and Robert Camorow for their assistance, respectively editorial and clerical, in the preparation of this paper. My colleagues in the National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center of Teachers College have influenced my thinking on the topic in question; in addition, Alejandro Rodriguez, Iris Sutherland, and Leslie Williams have helped me to clarify many of the problems discussed herein.

II. HISTORY OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Despite the migration of large numbers of non-English-speaking people to this country in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, prior to 1968 little attention was paid by the Federal government to bilingual education or to the problems of non-English-dominant minority students. The factors that led to a change in this also provide answers to the often-asked question: Why do these groups need special treatment? My group (Italian, East European, German, Belgian, etc.) didn't get it, why should they? (This question is sometimes linked to a philosophy of education that says children will learn faster if they are taught only in English, and that bilingual education is actually doing them a disservice.)

Today's linguistic minorities are different from those of past years, and the generation of 1968 is different from previous ones. The most obvious difference is the size of the non-English-speaking population. In many parts of the country (e.g. Southern California, parts of Texas, New York City, and Miami) the concentration of Spanish-speaking peoples had become so great by 1968 that it was virtually without precedent in the United States. All current indications point to a continued growth of these populations. While those labeled "Hispanic" are not necessarily assumed to be Spanish-speaking, Pifer (1980) estimates that today Hispanics comprise 30 percent of the school population in New York City, 45 percent in Los Angeles, 52 percent in San Antonio, 32 percent in Miami, 31 percent in Denver, and 35 percent in Hartford. (It should be noted that because of the Hispanic impetus for Federal involvement in bilingual education, the literature that we are discussing is most often about Hispanics, even though other groups are in need of and currently being served by bilingual programming.)

Another factor leading to changes in Federal policies for bilingual students was the recognition, by some, that equal educational opportunity was a myth for large numbers of the students not able to learn in English. Whether the real reason was educational/linguistic or more directly a reflection of discrimination against Hispanic groups in the larger society, Hispanic students were seriously disadvantaged educationally, compared to their classmates. They had joined, with Black and Native Americans, a level of American society from which it was difficult to emerge. Merely changing languages, or in some cases surnames as well, was not enough for many of these people to escape what Ogbu (1974, 1978) was to call the caste-like status into which they were placed by the larger society. Further, the civil rights movement had taken place, and the consciousness of the nation about discrimination against Blacks was rising; this concern was transferred to and sought by Hispanic leaders. Indeed, as we will see in the next pages, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was itself to become the chief impetus for bilingual education in the United States. This was clearly a situation different from the one that characterized previous migrations to the United States.

Federal attention to the non-English-minority students received further impetus from the desire on the part of certain ethnic groups not to give up their culture. (This led to a general confusion of language and culture which still persists.) Two fundamentally different arguments were in fact offered for bilingual education, and the contradiction between those arguments is worth examining. It was argued, on the one hand, that teaching children in English only was not only ineffective, but destructive of the child's culture, which could only be preserved by teaching and learning in Spanish—an argument for maintenance models of bilingual education. On the other hand, it was argued that transitional (to English) bilingual education was necessary because without it, Hispanic children would not learn enough to gain employment and resources in the English-speaking world. Maintenance (of Spanish) bilingual programming would be protective of the child's identity and cultural heritage, but not designed to help the child learn English (transitional), which was important to guarantee economic equity over the long haul. Failure to do so would perpetuate a caste-like dependent group.

In response to these sometimes conflicting trends, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 emerged. The act stated that:

> . . . in recognition of the special education needs of the large number of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out *new and imaginative* elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet those special educational needs. [PL 90-247,1/2/68, Stat 816 Sec. 702]

The act made its first priority the learning of English.

> Bilingual education was to accomplish three purposes: (1) *increase* English language skills, (2) maintain and *perhaps* increase mother tongue skills, and (3) support the cultural heritage of the student. [Leibowitz 1980:24]

While it is, therefore, supportive of the transitional view, the act gained the support of the proponents of the maintenance view as well. Although the act gave home language and culture lower priorities, it was clearly an improvement over the status quo of English-only instruction.

Congress has continued to strengthen the emphasis on English language purpose in the Bilingual Education Amendments of 1974:

> The goal of the program in the Committee Bill is to permit a limited English-speaking child to develop proficiency in English that permits the child to learn as effectively in English as in the child's native language—a vital requirement to compete effectively in society. [Senate Report 93-763, Education Amendments of 1974:45]

In 1978, they declared that the policy was

> . . . to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English proficiency, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language. [Bilingual Education Act, as amended, Sec. 702(a) (7) B]

In 1970, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became, for the first time directly, an instrument for bilingual education in the United States. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, mailed a memorandum to all school districts in the United States listing the following areas of concern related to the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act in educational practice:

> 1. Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.
>
> 2. School districts must not assign national origin-minority group students to classes for the mentally retarded on the basis of criteria which essentially measure or evaluate English language skills; nor may school districts deny national origin-minority group children access to college preparatory courses on a basis directly related to the failure of the school system to inculcate English language skills.
>
> 3. Any ability grouping or tracking system employed by the school system to deal with the special language skill needs of national origin-minority group children must be designed to meet such language skill needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational dead-end or permanent track.
>
> 4. School districts have the responsibility to adequately notify national origin-minority group parents of school activities which are called to the attention of other parents. Such notice in order to be adequate may have to be provided in a language other than English.
>
> School districts should examine current practices which exist in their districts in order to assess compliance with the matters set forth in this memorandum. A school district which determines that compliance problems currently exist in that district should immediately communicate in writing with the Office for Civil Rights and indicate what steps are being taken to remedy the situation. Where compliance questions arise as to the sufficiency of programs designed to meet the language skill needs of national origin-minority group children already operating in a particular area, full information regarding such programs should be provided. In the area of special language assistance, the scope of the program and the process for identifying need and the extent to which the need is fulfilled should be set forth. [Office for Civil Rights, Memorandum of May 25, 1970]

While the memorandum was largely ignored, it was used as the basis of a lawsuit in San Francisco in which a parent named Lau in effect brought suit against the city of San Francisco (in the person of school superintendent Nichols) for depriving his child of equal educational opportunity because of her national origin. The city maintained, among other things, that it was not discriminating on the basis of national origin, but simply carrying out its traditional function of providing schooling in English. While this might have the same effect of denying non-English-speaking children equal education, they were being given the same opportunity to learn in English as everyone else—if they couldn't, it was their problem,

not the district's. The district's responsibility was to provide the opportunity, and that would be in English. The district maintained that nothing in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 mandated different treatment for non-English-dominant children, and that OCR had exceeded its authority by interpreting the law as it had. Although Lau's attorneys also claimed protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court in its *Lau* v. *Nichols* decision did not reach that argument, and ruled simply that the OCR had correctly interpreted the 1964 act, and that the rules it had promulgated in the May memorandum had to be followed.

III. SOCIOPOLITICAL CONTEXT

Lau v. *Nichols* had the effect of putting virtually every school district of the United States with more than five percent non-English-dominant students on notice that it was violating Federal law if it had not complied with the May 1970 memorandum. Few such districts were able to show that they had. Over ensuing years these districts faced two choices: get into compliance with that memo or be found out of compliance with that memorandum by subsequent OCR investigation and be forced to comply. This latter step would require the district to create a "compliance plan" that would convince the Federal government that past discrimination against these national origin groups would cease since, under contract, the district would now take affirmative steps to guarantee educational equity. These plans were heavily influenced by a document known as the "Lau remedies." Written by a committee composed more of academics than practitioners, it specified steps that would ensure a district's compliance with Lau. While it was acknowledged that other solutions might also work, a plan following the Lau remedies was assured of successful review by OCR. The remedies, since they apply to districts found to be doing something illegal, however inadvertently, are intended to assure relief to the students. The Lau decision and its results, therefore, are linked to a larger issue of the loss of local autonomy over education, which some saw begun by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We may think of this as the first of what we will describe as five larger political problems with which bilingual education has become enmeshed: loss of local autonomy.

The record of compliance with Lau since 1974 has been uneven. It should be remembered that Lau does not require or even mandate bilingual education, but states that a bilingual program is one appropriate way to get into compliance with the law. This may seem hair-splitting to some, but it is nevertheless widely assumed that Lau mandates bilingual education; it does not. It mandates that a child not be disadvantaged, compared to other children, because of his or her language. The Lau decision has crystallized Federal policy toward bilingual education, however, and has served as a lightning rod for political opponents of bilingualism. The Supreme Court was clearly ahead of

the legislative branch in saying that a child had a *right* to instruction in his or her native language under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, since Lau could be undone only by modifying the Civil Rights Act itself, which would open the whole act to review, there is great reluctance to change Lau, even by some of its strongest critics, for fear of what might happen if other parts of the law were also changed. In any event, part of the controversy attaching to Lau is really a conflict between legislative prerogatives on the one hand, and the executive's use of regulations, on the other—in this case backed by the judiciary—to construct policy. And this has become the second political problem with which Lau is enmeshed.

Beside Title VII funds, the Office of Education took a number of steps to help local school districts get into compliance with the 1970 memorandum—but only *after* the 1974 decision, not before it. This delay did not help the implementation process from 1970 to 1974 or later. An apparent inconsistency, therefore, was the third political reality that school districts had to face.

In 1975, USOE established nine "Lau Centers" across the country in regions with large numbers of non-English-dominant students. These centers were located for the most part at universities and were designed to assist local school districts by providing technical assistance to enable them to develop Lau-sensitive programming. While USOE had previously made funds available under Title VII to such districts, they now withheld or threatened to withhold all ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) funds if districts were out of compliance and had no compliance plan approved. Lau Centers were to help them. The amounts of money for Title VII and Lau Center programs are small, however, in comparison to the needs of the populations to be served, and funds have been eroded by inflation over the years. The bulk of the money for implementing Lau has had to come, and must continue to come, from local funds (themselves scarce) over which extreme competition exists. Funding, then, becomes the fourth, and perhaps crucial, political problem faced by bilingual education since Lau.

A further difficulty is that, in implementing Lau, school districts have not only relied on Title VII funds for help, but have often imitated Title VII programs. However, ESEA was designed and continues to be a compensatory program, that is, a program designed to remediate a perceived deficit. The language of compensatory programming is absent from the Lau decision. Indeed, the whole thrust of Lau is that the mismatch between the home language and the language of instruction is the district's responsibility, not the child's fault. Further, the 1968 legislation implicitly mandated transitional bilingual education. This means that children should learn English as quickly as possible. Lau mandates instead that children be instructed in their native language until they can learn in English, and that instruction in English not be at the expense of their learning required subjects in their native tongue. In the past,

children were taken out of regular programming and given nothing but ESL (English as Second Language) until they functioned in English and could be put into regular programming, even if this put them years behind in school. Under Lau this could be illegal. Under the compensatory models, teachers and administrators often saw children as not only linguistically disadvantaged, but unmotivated and underachieving as well. The programs mandated under Title VII had more than linguistic goals; they were also designed to get children functioning better in school environments. Lau makes no other assumption than that teaching in a language children do not understand is the problem. But because of the link between bilingual education and ESEA Title VII, new programming earns the enmity of those opposed to the paternalistic assumptions of compensatory models, thus creating the fifth political problem with which bilingual programming since Lau has become enmeshed.

In addition to these five political hornets' nests, problems of a more practical nature also characterize bilingual programming today. Teachers are not trained to deal with the heterogeneous language skills of children in bilingual educational programs; nor do we have very good ways for even measuring the diversity.

Then too, the home languages of linguistic minority groups such as Hispanics have lower status than English in the reward system of the larger society (Ogbu 1978). This social problem invades the classroom itself, providing an advantage to White Anglo students and disadvantaging Hispanics. As we shall see in the next section, Troike (1978) concluded that the relative social and cultural status of groups in the community may be a fundamental variable that affects the outcome of bilingual programming:

> It is significant that children who succeed so notably . . . are for the most part middle-class children from supportive homes whose language and culture are in no way threatened or demeaned by their being taught in another language. [Troike 1978: 18-19]

There also continues to be a shortage of well-trained teachers to staff bilingual classrooms. Gray (1980) reports that less than 14 percent of such teachers have even one course in bilingual education.

Add to this disturbing picture the fact that, for the political reasons just reviewed, implementation has been actively resisted, both overtly and covertly, and the picture becomes even more confusing. In New York City, for example, it is now six years since the Aspira consent decree, under which the city accepted a legally binding requirement that it implement bilingual programming for children whose English language "deficiency" prevents their effective participation in the learning process, and the implementation is far from complete (see Santiago-Santiago 1978). Districts that genuinely wished to move also found their efforts thwarted by a lack of basic knowledge of language assessment, preventing a rational placement of children in programs. Add to this the lack of adequately trained staff and other factors just described, and it is

questionable whether any reasonable assessment of bilingual education could take place in even 25 percent of the schools claiming to have such programs. Finally, a well-planned program, even one exemplary in every respect, is still subject to all the normal hazards of educational programming.

IV. EVALUATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The Problems

While research concerning bilingual programming is important, it receives very little funding from the Federal government. Consequently, there has been little critical research and virtually no longitudinal research (but see Cohen et al. 1975, Lambert and Tucker 1972) to evaluate the potential or actual effectiveness of bilingual programming. In fact, by one estimate, less than half of one percent of Federal funds allocated to bilingual education are actually devoted to research. (Other countries offering bilingual education, notably Canada and Scandinavia, have spent much higher proportions of funds on research, sometimes as much as 50 percent.) Fundamental or basic research studies that may lead to programs are particularly sparse. The existing research base is dominated by after-the-fact evaluations of existing projects.* But these studies reveal important flaws in the design of evaluation research more often than they illuminate anything about the strengths or failings of the bilingual programs themselves (see e.g. Rodriguez-Brown 1978, Cardenas 1977, Zappert and Cruz 1977). When the Center for Applied Linguistics surveyed over 150 evaluations reports to develop a master plan that would enable San Francisco to get into compliance with the requirements laid down by the Supreme Court in *Lau* v. *Nichols*, they found that only seven met minimal criteria for research design that could produce useful information (Troike 1978). A survey of 108 evaluations by the Northwest Regional Laboratory rejected all but three. The problems included: no control for socioeconomic status, inadequate or improper sampling techniques, absence of baseline or control data, absence of measure of initial language dominance, the presence of significant confounding variables (teacher qualification, e.g.), and insufficient or improper statistical manipulations (Zappert and Cruz 1977). In the studies that did meet their criteria, Zappert and Cruz found that only one percent of the comparisons showed negative outcomes for bilingual programs, while 58 percent of the comparisons were positive, and 41 percent showed no differences. For the last statistic they note:

---

*The National Diffusion Networks are currently disseminating information about successful programs. For information write: Educational Diffusion, Materials Support Center, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94013.

> . . . a non-significant effect is not a negative finding with respect to bilingual education. A non-significant effect, that students in bilingual education classes are learning at the same rate as students in monolingual classes, demonstrates the fact that learning in two languages does not interfere with a student's academic and cognitive performance. [Zappert and Cruz 1977:39]

In addition, such students have the advantage of learning a second language.

The well-designed studies that have been done have shown that bilingual education fosters cognitive development, achievement in school, positive attitudes toward schooling, and positive attitudes toward other ethnic groups. Other studies have shown improved second language acquisition, readiness for schooling, and improved self concept. It must also be noted that other studies have contradicted each of these findings. But since these studies were done on different programs, and there is no one definition of what constitutes a bilingual program, we may be comparing apples and pears. It is simply not possible, given the current research, to explore precisely what characteristics of programs produce which simple successful outcomes in order to compare them with programs producing negative outcomes, as obvious as that need may seem.

Particular Studies

The purpose of this section is to examine what we have learned to date from overall evaluations of bilingual education, and to focus on critical issues common to all such evaluation efforts. We first review a study said by Leibowitz (1980) to have had considerable influence on the 1978 educational amendments, then review other studies perhaps more worthy of attention.

The American Institute for Research Study. The American Institute for Research (AIR) published the results of a three-year, 1.3 million dollar study conducted under contract with the United States Office of Education to examine 38 Title VII projects with a total of 12,000 students. Given the influence this study seems to have had, a few observations about this massive undertaking are pertinent:

1. The research design called for the compiling of data from many separate projects, each having different purposes, staffs, and programming. Such differences may have obscured the design, rendering the results uninterpretable.
2. Such designs evaluate programs that have received Federal funds without checking independently to see if the funds have been spent as they were intended. (This results in an evaluation of the performance of districts receiving Federal funds, which is not the same thing at all as an evaluation of the Federally funded programs.)
3. AIR evaluated performance by pretesting children at the beginning of the year and posttesting at the end of the year for each grade studied, thus limiting the main effects to what could be observed over a period of *six months,* without considering cumulative (year

after year) effects. As Pifer (1980) has observed, it takes a longer time for bilingual programming to have its effect than we initially believed.

4. AIR took little time to investigate the previous experience of the students. We know that the average number of years previously spent in bilingual education is three years for the sixth grade group. Why were these children switched into Title VII programs late in their careers? What was the effect of the switch? Were these in fact children who were failing and were placed in what was seen as a remedial program? This would have the effect of biasing the evaluation of Title VII programs by over-representing two unpromising groups: those children who hadn't made it in regular programming and those who hadn't learned English in Title VII programs and had remained there.
5. No attempt was made to follow up students who succeeded in Title VII programs and returned to regular programs.
6. AIR chose to lump results across all programs, making no attempt to isolate successful programs from unsuccessful programs. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain what constitutes successful programs: the whole Federal effort rides or falls on the group norms. It can be seen as a device to minimize both *positive* results (by those politically opposed to bilingual programming) and *negative* results (by proponents of bilingual programming). See Cardenas (1977) and Gray (1980).
7. Since the goals of Title VII are both linguistic and the improvement of school performance, evaluation instruments measure both variables. It is unrealistic to expect, particularly in a six-month period, any program to show improvement in both goals. Yet a failure in either is considered a program failure. Further, since it is technically difficult to measure language usage, most weight falls on the school performance variables. When this is understood in the context of the points made earlier (4) about the previous program experiences over-representing underachievers in the higher grades, the methodological limitations become acute.

The St. Lambert Studies. We now turn to a discussion of a very different style of evaluation research—the studies of Lambert and Tucker (1972) on evaluations of bilingual programming in St. Lambert, Quebec. To be sure, the sociopolitical context of bilingual programming in Quebec is different from that in the United States, but the political controversy is similar. The St. Lambert study is of one program designed to make truly bilingual (in French/English) children currently functioning in English only. The programming was basically immersion—programming in the second language (hereafter L2) only—except for two half-hour daily periods in English. Children were volunteered for the program by parents, and this meant a high degree of home support could be expected. Parents were heavily consulted and became part of the overall

program design. English-only control classes were also given, and children in the treatment group and the control group were carefully matched for intelligence, social class, and parental attitudes toward the French-Canadian people and culture. Moreover, the control parents were as motivated as the experimental parents in wanting their children to learn French!

Children were tested annually and followed through the program until fourth grade, in contrast to the six-month follow-up period for the AIR study. The evaluation was limited to language learning, language proficiency attitudes, and cognitive flexibility—not performance in school, as was true of the AIR-studied Title VII programming. Children were carefully matched on intelligence and social class variables with controls, unlike the AIR study. Finally, in assessing linguistic competence, Lambert and his colleagues assessed both English and French, whereas such dual assessments are rare in other research. Indeed, testing in or reporting results for L2 only is very much a trait of American studies.

Results from Canada indicate that:

1. The bilingual/experimental group was doing just as well as the monolingual/English control group at the end of Grade IV in reading ability, reading comprehension, and knowledge of English concepts. The bilingual group, as well as the controls, was above the 80th percentile of national norms in English word knowledge, word discrimination, and language use.
2. The bilingual group also compared extremely well with children from French-speaking homes who were following a French program. The competency in French increased the longer they were in the program. Although they were not as fluent as French speakers, their vocabulary and comprehension were as good.

These results show the importance of the research design in determining the outcome of the evaluation. Careful matching of students on school performance characteristics as well as socioeconomic and home characteristics is essential to an evaluation of a program concerning language. Gain of competency in L2 in the Canadian study came over time—not in six months. Longitudinal evaluation is essential for adequate treatment of bilingual programming. Competency in L2 did not come at the expense of L1 learning and competence. This is an important point in the political debate in the United States.

Ramifications of Lambert's Study. Lambert distinguishes between additive bilingualism and subtractive bilingualism. In subtractive bilingualism the learning of the second language is at the expense of the learning of the first language. In additive bilingualism, there is no supposed loss. I think it important to distinguish additive bilingualism from enrichment models of bilingual education. In enrichment programming, as described by Fishman and others, the child is enriched by L2 but there is no presumed penalty to be paid if the child fails to learn. In additive programming, linguistic competence is clearly the goal, and certain

penalties can be expected to be paid in the larger society by a child living in French Canada who does not learn French, akin to the penalty a child living in New York City without English might have to pay.

Lambert maintains that negative results in bilingual education tend to be associated with programs fostering subtractive bilingualism. These would be the kind of programs funded by Title VII in which the goal is often English at the expense of L1 (Spanish). Therefore, we might argue that even if a reasonable evaluation of Title VII programming were accomplished, such *programming* would unlikely achieve a record of sustained growth in L1 and L2. Studies of Finnish migrants to Sweden show that programs that neglect L1 impair learning of both L1 and L2! Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976, 1977) found that when children immigrated to Sweden at preschool or primary school ages, they did more poorly than children who immigrated after five or six years of education in their native (Finnish) language. Troike (1978) argues a similar pattern exists in the U.S. Southwest for Mexican Americans. My students and I have also observed that when young Caribbean migrant children in New York City are immersed in L2 programming, they can fail to develop competence in either language.

This suggests that younger subordinated minority children should be in L1 until they function adequately, but that for older minority children immersion approaches in L2, which do not ignore L1, might succeed. If programs that provide for continued development in L1 improve acquisition of L2, this is an important point. It argues that for younger children the traditional distinction between maintenance and transitional programming is inappropriate. The best transitional program is one which provides a maintenance of learning in L1! These programs are therefore developmental: L2 is added to a continuing base of L1. Programs that erode the base of L1 can impair the learning of L2.

This clarifies some of the findings of the studies reviewed for this paper. It supports our own experience in the implementation of Lau. Prior to Lau and the Lau remedies, a non-English-speaking child was removed from regular programming and given intensive training in an ESL kind of programming. From the point of view of the courts, this deprived the child of continuing development in those subjects—math, science, social studies, etc.—required of all children in the school. In a similar sense, a program that tries to inculcate L2 at the expense of L1 deprives children of a continuing development of communication skills that are important to them in non-school areas of life. Many programs, like those studied by Cohen and Laosa (1976) and by Legarreta (1977) are conducted primarily in English, whatever the readiness of the child, perhaps leading to a negative perception of Spanish, and certainly raising questions about the adequacy of L1 development. Since much language learning goes on outside of school, the child under these conditions is disadvantaged in comparison to children whose home language development is reinforced by the school. In our evaluations we must never lose

sight of the fact that we are examining what is happening to children in only one part of their lives. We must be attentive to the interaction between school, home, and peer effects in understanding our evaluation data. This means that we must have reasonably clear data about the treatment of L1 and L2 not only in the school, but in the community as well.

Trying to learn to read simultaneously in two languages can be confusing. One well-constructed longitudinal study was done of a bilingual program in Redwood City, California, in which reading in both L1 and L2 is introduced at the same time. (Cohen and Laosa 1976). Their findings show that reading competency in both languages is retarded by such an approach. Strangely, children scored below control classrooms in reading English as well as in Spanish, even though the control classrooms had no instruction in reading Spanish! This finding is interesting in regard to the AIR studies, because 52 percent of Title VII programs in 1969-1970 were of this type (Troike 1978).

Lambert's work also supports the notion that slow, steady growth of programs with strong community support is preferable to instant solutions. We will raise this point in our discussion of exemplary bilingual programs, to which we now turn, but it is important to emphasize that few of the American programs to be evaluated—and by definition, none of the studies evaluated by AIR—met this criterion.

V. EXEMPLARY BILINGUAL PROGRAMMING

Recognizing the inadequacies of the data base, we can review what we know and artificially construct an exemplary program by examining characteristics related to positive outcomes in research reviewed in evaluation studies approved by Troike, and Zappert and Cruz, and in our own experience at the Lau Center in New York during the past five years. Our composite exemplary bilingual program seeks to achieve two goals: acquisition of another language and protection of equal educational opportunity.

District Level Criteria

In our experience, crucial to the success of bilingual programming is the commitment of district level staff to bilingual education—from district superintendent (or surrogate) level all the way down to the building principal level. The allocation of district resources to bilingual programming is an indication of staff commitment. For example, successful programs often have their teachers on tax levy or regular funding rather than special Federal funding or at least in addition to special Federal funding. Through the allocation of local resources, the bilingual program is given a greater likelihood of continuity and stability, which improves the opportunity for planning on a more than year by year basis —and which makes a more attractive job opportunity for staff. Investment of local funds is also a tip-off to the attitude of district staff toward

bilingual programming. Finally, the investment of time and energy in planning is improved when the staff is stable enough to see the fruits of such planning over time.

Another criteria at the district level is the community support for bilingual programming. The importance of such efforts have been argued by Brisk (1977), Inclan (1976), Andersson (1970), and Botana (1975); their studies indicate that things go better when community support initiates a bilingual program in the district. (This does not mean unanimity, but rather that some local initiative takes place.) There is also evidence that it is useful for local ethnic groups to be represented at the district level, either on the school board or at the administrative level (see Bouton 1975, Gottlieb 1964, Shiraishi 1975, and Ogbu 1978).

School Level Criteria

At the school level, coordination between the bilingual program and the rest of the school is important. This can be measured in a number of ways. Does the school administration accept the responsibility of coordinating the bilingual and monolingual components? Is there an administrative policy of orienting the staff of the school to the purpose and process of bilingual education? Do ESL and bilingual staff meet jointly? Is the bilingual program integrated with the rest of the school? Are similar support services available to non-English-dominant students and monolingual English-speaking students—e.g., counselors, reading specialists, etc.? Do the majority of teachers in the school accept the bilingual teachers and the bilingual program? Are the attitudes of the school principal and other school administrators in line authority over the program accepting and supportive? Attitudes of school staff toward bilingual programming are crucial to the success or failure of a bilingual program (see Fishman 1974). Sometimes bilingual programming is perceived as a threat by existing staff—especially when local tax dollars will support the program.

The degree to which administrative and teaching staff are sensitive to the goals (educational and occupational) of the cultural groups in the district is another important criteria at the school level. Brice-Heath and others (Brice-Heath 1978, Philips 1972) have argued that programs whose options reflect the goals of the community groups are more successful. There are several ways to assess this. Do parents have options for their children? Can parents with different goals for their children find programming suitable to their goals? Such options might include

1. a transitional bilingual sequence where parents can choose to have students use Spanish as a bridge to an all-English curriculum
2. an all-English curriculum—immersion in English
3. a program of continuing support for Spanish in addition to option 1
4. different teaching styles (traditional vs. open) from which parents may choose the one they are most familiar with or value most

These options are also important because children not performing well in one program may be moved to another more suitable one.

Respect for the cultural values of the community groups is evident when school-community relations are given priority by the administrative staff, notices are sent home in the parents' native languages, and parents are involved in school activities other than in program activities.

Program Level Criteria

In an exemplary bilingual program, students are not assigned to a program, they (or their parents) influence the choice of program. Free choice of program can provide parents with a powerful lever against the segregation of their children: if parents find a program to be stigmatized, they can take their children out and choose another.

One of the dangers of bilingual education programs is that they can become ghettoized. They can become stigmatized as remedial. This is not the case in an exemplary bilingual program. The advantages of an integrated education over a segregated one are well documented. Nothing concerned with linguistic ability changes that fact. While it may be necessary at certain points of the day to isolate children into groups on the basis of their linguistic ability, this need not justify the creation of linguistically segregated classrooms. Indeed, research strongly suggests that there are positive advantages to linguistically integrated classrooms. In a two-way program, English-dominant students learn and develop skills in Spanish at the same time that Spanish-dominant students learn English. Since these are voluntary assignments, English-speaking students are here because they want to be. (See Gardner 1967, for the one-way/two-way distinction.) A two-way reciprocal program provides the opportunity for peer learning—for informal learning of the second language from peers who speak that language as natives. John et al. (1969) and Cazden and Leggett (1976) stress the importance of peer learning as one of the most effective methods of learning a second language.

What is it exactly that exemplary bilingual programs do differently in terms of curriculum, teaching, and outcomes? As we have seen, one of the most vexing problems facing planners of bilingual programming is the question of language learning, particularly in the area of reading. In an exemplary program for older children, a child already reading in L1 would not have his or her development in L1 reading stopped. It would continue along with the learning of L2.

Should a younger child learn to read first in L1 or L2? Research surveyed by Engle (1975) suggests that learning to read in L1 is the best approach, and this is supported for lower status languages by the literature reviewed earlier. Modiano (1968) also addresses this issue. The issue is complex, however. Consider the following three situations:

1. A child enters reading not at all, and is entirely Spanish monolingual.

2. A child enters with some reading ability in Spanish, and is Spanish monolingual.
3. A child enters with some reading ability in Spanish and English and is bilingual.

For elementary school children, particularly before age 10, the literature *suggests* Spanish reading instruction as the most effective for child *1*. The same would be true for child *2*. The decision for child *3* is more problematic: We don't have an answer firmly grounded in research.

While mastery of reading in Spanish by elementary students facilitates later transfer of reading skills to English and premature transfer can impede reading in both languages, there is also evidence that oral ESL development should precede learning to read in English (Robinett 1965).

Content learning in social studies, math, and science proceeds in L1 in the exemplary bilingual programs until a child has reached sufficient competence in English to opt into English-only instruction programming. Teachers also structure their classrooms to accommodate a range of learning styles. Particularly significant is the work of Ramirez and Castenada (1974) on learning styles; that of Cazden and Leggett (1976) is also important.

One of the curricular benefits of having children from different cultural backgrounds in one program is that in interacting with other students, they learn about cultures different from their own (Gibson 1976). Involved parents can benefit from this, too. In addition, students bring to the classrooms different school histories and experiences in other schools as well as different competencies and skills that can often benefit from a heterogeneous grade grouping.

The issue of linguistic assessment is an especially troubling one, as is the problem of training teachers to deal with the linguistic diversity they will actually encounter in classrooms. Low staff turnover is characteristic of successful bilingual programming. The rate should be comparable to the other programs of the school. As to staff capabilities, in addition to meeting the same certification requirements as regular programming staff, they should

1. have communicative competence in both languages (Hymes 1967)
2. be sensitive to cultural differences
3. have a graduate degree geared to teaching in bilingual programs
4. reflect the ethnicity of the students in the community (as a group, not individually by teacher) and live in the community
5. attend periodic in-service and conference activities in bilingual education

With the exception of the first, these are simply criteria associated with good staff in any program.

What, ultimately, should a successful bilingual program achieve? First, the range of achievement in L1 instruction in required subjects should be no different from the average for English-only students. Second, for older children, the range of achievement in reading and func-

tioning in English should over time—say several years—be comparable to the range of achievement among English monolingual students. For younger and older children, oral English should show improvement. Cazden and Leggett (1976) have also suggested a high percentage of students participating in class as a desirable output characteristic. But, in essence, successful bilingual programs are those that meet the two criteria we set out at the beginning: they achieve language acquisition without setting the child back in his or her skill development.

In summary, we have reviewed the history of Federal involvement in bilingual education, the present sociopolitical context, the research and evaluation research base upon which we must build, and concluded with a brief review of all these factors in examining the components of an exemplary program. That bilingual programs to date have been able to demonstrate any success whatsoever is testament to the need for such programs, and the urgent need for critical research that would allow us to construct programs to implement what Lau was intended to implement: equal educational opportunity for America's linguistic minorities

REFERENCES

Andersson, T., and M. Boyer
1970 *Bilingual Schooling in the United States.* 2 Vols. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. 589pp. ED 039 527.

Botana, J.
1975 "Community Involvement in Bilingual Programs." *Illinois Career Education Journal* 33 (1): 17-18.

Bouton, L.
1975 "Meeting the Needs of Children with Diverse Linguistic and Ethnic Backgrounds." *Foreign Language Annals* 8 (4): 306-16.

Brice-Heath, S.
1978 *AIR Evaluation of Bilingual Education.* San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association.

Brisk, M.E.
1977 *The Role of the Bilingual Community in Mandated Bilingual Education. CAL/ERIC/CLL Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 49.* Arlington, Va: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. 21pp. ED 138 086.

Cazden, C.B., and E.L. Leggett
1976 *Culturally Responsive Education: A Response to Lau Remedies II.* Paper prepared for Conference on Research and Policy Implications of the Task Force Report of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights: Lau Remedies. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. 52pp. ED 135 241.

Cohen, A.D., A. Fathman, and B. Merino
1976 *The Redwood City Bilingual Education Project, 1971-1974: Spanish and English Proficiency, Mathematics and Language Use Overtime. Working Papers on Bilingualism No. 8.* Pp. 1-29. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. ED 125 248.

Cohen, A.D., and M. Laosa
1976 "Second Language Instruction: Some Research Considerations." *Curriculum Studies* 8(2): 149-165.

Danoff, M.N., et al.
1977 *Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs:* Vols. I and II. Palo Alto, California: American Institute for Research in Behavioral Science.

Engle, P.L.
1975 *The Use of Vernacular Language in Education: Language Medium in Early School Years for Minority Language Groups.* Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fishman, J.A.
1974 *A Sociology of Bilingual Education.* Final Report of Research under Contract OECO-73-0538, Division of Foreign Studies, Department of HEW USOE.

Gardner, B.A.
1967 "Organization of the Bilingual School." *Journal of Social Issues* 23:110-120.

Gibson, M.
1976 "Approaches to Multicultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumptions." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 7(4): 7-18.

Gottlieb, D.
1964 "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers." *Sociology of Education* 37: 345-353.

Gray, T.
1980 *Research in Bilingual Education: Implications for Lau Compliance.* Paper presented at the National Conference for Title IV Directors of State Educational Agencies and Desegregation Assistance Centers, Washington, D.C., January 29.

Hymes, D.
1967 "Models on Interaction of Language and Social Setting." *The Journal of Social Issues* 23: 8-23.

Inclan, R.G.
1976 "School-Community Relations." *Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 1(2): 73-77.

Intercultural Development Research Association
1977 *The AIR Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/ English Bilingual Education Programs: An IDRA Response with a Summary by Dr. Jose Cardenas.* 27pp. ED 151 435.

John, V., et al.
1969 "American Voices." *The Center Forum, No. 7.* New York, New York: Center for Urban Education.

Lambert, W.E., and G.R. Tucker
1972 *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Legarreta, D.
1977 "Language Choice in Bilingual Classrooms." *TESOL Quarterly* 11(1): 9-16.

Leibowitz, A.H.
1980 *The Bilingual Education Act: A Legislative Analysis.* Arlington, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Modiano, N.
1968 "Bilingual Education for Children of Linguistic Minorities." *American Indigena* 28: 405-415.

Ogbu, J.
1974 *The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood.* New York: Academic Press.

1978 *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective.* New York: Academic Press.

Pifer, A.
1980 *Bilingual Education and the Hispanic Challenge.* 1979 Annual Report. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Philips, S.
1972 "Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom." In *Functions of Language in the Classroom.* C. Cazden, et al., eds. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ramirez, M. III, and A. Castenada
1974 *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Education.* New York: Academic Press.

Robinett, R.A.
1965 *A "Linguistic" Approach to Beginning Reading for Bilingual Children. Perspectives in Reading, No. 5.* First Grade Reading Programs, International Reading Association. 21pp. ED 001 694.

Rodriquez-Brown, F.
1978 *The Do's and Don'ts in Regard to the Evaluation of Bilingual Programs.* Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education in San Juan, Puerto Rico, April. 18pp. ED 156 717.

Santiago-Santiago, I.
1978 *A Community's Struggle for Equal Educational Opportunity: Aspira v. Board of Education. OME Monograph Number Two.* Princeton, N.J.: Office of Minority Education, Educational Testing Service. 126pp. ED 162 034.

Shiraishi, R.R.
1975 *Effects of A Bilingual/Bicultural Career Guidance Project on the Occupational Aspirations of Puerto Rican Adolescents.* Unpublished dissertation. Boston: Boston University School of Education.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., and P. Toukomaa
1976 *Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Socio-Cultural Situation of the Migrant Family.* Helsinki: Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Toukomaa, P., and T. Skutnabb-Kangas
1977 *The Intensive Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Migrant Children of Pre-School Age. Research Report No. 26.* Tampere: Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere, Finland.

Troike, R.C.
1978 *Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education.* Arlington, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. 23pp. ED 159 900.

Zappert, L.T., and B.R. Cruz
1977 *Bilingual Education: An Appraisal of Empirical Research.* Berkeley, Ca.: Bay Area Bilingual Education League/Lau Center, 106pp. ED 153 758.